

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending, with claims 1-4 and 6-8 being independent.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected as being anticipated by Sako (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,061). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Sako does not describe or suggest making liquid crystals of an active matrix liquid crystal display device monostable while applying electric voltages having the same polarity to the pixel electrode, as recited in claim 1, or while applying electric voltages having the same polarity to the pixel electrode and irradiating the liquid crystal with ultraviolet rays, as recited in claim 2. Instead, Sako recites applying an AC voltage (i.e., a voltage that has an alternating polarity rather than the recited same polarity) to the liquid crystal layer 9 to make the liquid crystal monostable. See Sako at col. 8, lines 17-23.

In addition, instead of being directed to an active matrix display device (in which each pixel is driven by applying a voltage to a pixel electrode through a TFT in the pixel), Sako appears to be directed to a passive matrix type liquid crystal, which is driven by the method of carrying out ON/OFF operation of a voltage with respect to the signal electrodes 3 and the scanning electrodes 5. (See Sako at column 8, lines 4-16.)

For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

Claims 3-14 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sako in view of Ito (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,685).

With respect to the claims that depend from claims 1 and 2, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Ito does not remedy the failure of Sako to describe or suggest making liquid crystals of an active matrix liquid crystal display device monostable while applying electric voltages having the same polarity to the pixel electrode, as recited in claim 1, or while applying electric voltages having the same polarity to the pixel electrode and irradiating the liquid crystal with ultraviolet rays, as recited in claim 2. While Ito describes an active matrix display device, Ito provides no discussion of making the liquid

crystals monostable and therefore does not describe or suggest doing so by applying electric voltages having the same polarity.

Like claims 1 and 2, independent claim 3 and 4 recite making the liquid crystals monostable by applying electric voltages having the same polarity to the pixel electrode. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4, and their dependent claims, for the reasons discussed above.

Applicant also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4, and their dependent claims, for the additional reason that neither Sako, Ito, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a period in which all gate wirings are selected simultaneously, as recited in claims 3 and 4. Indeed, while the rejection notes that Ito describes forming a thin film transistor with gate wirings, it nowhere asserts that Ito anywhere describes or suggest selecting all gate wirings simultaneously, and applicant has been unable to find any such description in Ito. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3 and 4, and their dependent claims, should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, and their dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Sako, Ito, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests forming a thin film transistor over a first insulating film, as recited in claims 6 and 7. The rejection acknowledges that Sako does not describe or suggest forming a thin film transistor over an insulating film and relies on Ito as doing so. However, while Ito describes forming a thin film transistor on a transparent insulating substrate 12, Ito does not describe doing so over an insulating film. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

With respect to claim 8, and its dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Sako, Ito, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests forming a first conductive film over a first surface of a first substrate and forming a thin film transistor over a second surface opposite to a first surface of the first substrate, as recited in claim 8. The rejection nowhere indicates where such formation is described or

Applicant : Yoshiharu Hirakata et al.  
Serial No. : 09/854,120  
Filed : May 10, 2001  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-275001 / US4910

suggested by Sako, Ito or the combination of the two. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Date: March 16, 2005

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40271487.doc